

Owner / Applicant Information

Williams D Michael
MDW Manangement LLC
300 OLIVE STREET

WABASH IN 46992

Phone 2605716088

Email MIKE.WILLIAMS.JR@MILLWRIGHTSOLUTIONSLLC.COM

Project Information

MDW Management LLC
300 Olive Street

Wabash 46992

County WABASH

Project Type New ☐ Addition ☐ Alteration ☐ Existing ☐ Change of Occupancy ☒

Project Status ☒ U F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled

IDHS Issued Correction order? ☐ Has Violation been Issued? ☐

Violation Issued by: NA

Local Building Official

Phone: Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone: Email:

Variance Details

Code Name: 2011 NFPA 25 Inspection, Testing and Maintenance of Water Based Fire Protection Systems
(675 IAC 28-1-12)

Conditions:

The current water based fire sprinkler system in the building is not pressurized inside the building. Building was purchased in September 2018, and it was not pressurized at the time.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or w

2

2= Applicant will undertake alternative actions in lieu of compliance with the rule to ensure that granting of the variance will not be adverse to public health, safety, or welfare. Explain why alternative actions would be adequate (be specific).

Facts: We have placed portable fire extinguishers throughout the building and near each exit/entrance.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

☐ Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.

☐ Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of major operational problems in the use of the building or structure.

☒ Y Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of excessive costs of additional or altered construction elements.

☐ Imposition of the rule would prevent the preservation of an architecturally or a historically significant part of the building or structure

Facts:

Variance Details

Code Name: 2010 NFPA 13 Installation of Sprinkler Systems (675 IAC 28-1-5)
675 IAC 28-1-5 Section 6.5.2

Conditions:

1. Building has standpipe water-based fire suppression system that has not been inspected or maintained.

2. Building was purchased in September 2018, and the previous owner had a variance permitting them to not use the fire suppression system.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or w

1

2= Applicant will undertake alternative actions in lieu of compliance with the rule to ensure that granting of the variance will not be adverse to public health, safety, or welfare. Explain why alternative actions would be adequate (be specific).

Facts:

1. Our building does not contain highly combustible or flammable agents.

2. Dry chemical portable fire extinguishers have been placed throughout the building and near every entrance/exit.

3. The building is wide open with multiple exits on each side.

4. Occupancy of building never exceeds 40 people. We only have 40 employees.

5. All paints and other chemicals are stored separately in fire/explosion proof containers.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of major operational problems in the use of the building or structure.

Y

 Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of excessive costs of additional or altered construction elements.

Imposition of the rule would prevent the preservation of an architecturally or a historically significant part of the building or structure

Facts:

The hardship would be imposed at the high financial cost of having the fire suppression system serviced, pressurized, inspected, and continually maintained.

Variance Details

Code Name: 2008 Indiana Building Code (675 IAC 13-2.5)
Section 10 Chapter 9

Conditions:

Premises are a 25,000 sq ft. steel industrial building constructed circa 1968. The original owner produced paper type products, so the plant was built with a high pressure sprinkler system. The previous owner shut down the fire suppression system and did not maintain it. The present owner purchased premises in 2018. The system has not been pressurized or maintained since 2014. The system is now more than 50 years old. It is doubtful the pipes could withstand the high pressure should the pump be activated.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or w

1

2= Applicant will undertake alternative actions in lieu of compliance with the rule to ensure that granting of the variance will not be adverse to public health, safety, or

ensure that granting of the variance will not be adverse to public health, safety, or welfare. Explain why alternative actions would be adequate (be specific).

Facts:

Premises has been inspected by representative from Inspection Services Office (ISO) and approved for insurance without sprinkler system.

Building contains multiple, well-lit fire exits on every side of the building.

Fire extinguisher distributed throughout the building and at every exit.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

- ☐ Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.
- ☐ Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of major operational problems in the use of the building or structure.
- ☒ Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of excessive costs of additional or altered construction elements.
- ☐ Imposition of the rule would prevent the preservation of an architecturally or a historically significant part of the building or structure

Facts:

Pressurizing and continued maintenance would require extensive replacement of piping and valves and a major updating of all of the fire sensing high pressure pump controls. All elements are more than 50 years old.